



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/787,227	02/27/2004	Bach H. Le	049051-0221	4842	
31824	7590	12/30/2010			
MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP				EXAMINER	
600 13th Street, NW				BELANI, KISHIN G	
Washington, DC 20005-3096		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
		2443			
		NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
		12/30/2010	ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mweipdocket@mwe.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/787,227	<b>Applicant(s)</b> LE ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> KISHIN G. BELANI	<b>Art Unit</b> 2443

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 October 2010.  
 2a) This action is **FINAL**.      2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 66-68 and 70-87 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 66-68 and 70-87 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-444)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

This action is in response to Applicants' amendment filed on 10/27/2010.

**Independent Claims 66 and 84 have been amended. Claims 66-68 and 70-87 are now pending** in the present application. The applicants' arguments and the examiner's response to the arguments is shown in the section "Response to Arguments" at the end of this office action. **This Action is made FINAL.**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

**Claim 85** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claimed feature of "prompting a user at the computing device ..." implies that the user is at the computing device, whereas the user is actually at the "remotely located computing device". The examiner has interpreted the claimed feature to recite "prompting the user at the remotely located computing device ...". Also, the claimed feature "transmitting, from the computing device to the remotely located computing device, the identification information ..." has been interpreted by the examiner to recite "transmitting, from the remotely located computing device to the computing device, the identification information ...".

Please confirm if the examiner's interpretation about these claimed features is what the applicants meant to disclose.

**The applicants have responded that the examiner's interpretation listed above is incorrect, and is opposite of the applicants' invention. On pages 7-8 of the "Remarks" section of the claim amendments, the applicants assert that "the computing device" corresponds to a thin client, and "the remotely located computing device" is a server. However, the abstract of the submitted application does not support applicants' assertion, wherein "the user is prompted for identification information at the remote computing device, and the identification information is transmitted from the remote computing device to the local computing device." Paragraph 0044 repeats the same details. Therefore, the 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph rejection for claim 85 cannot be withdrawn.**

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.

2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

**Claims 66, 70, 80, 82, 84 and 85** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Walker et al. (U.S. Patent Publication # 6,244,957 B1)** in view of **Shaffer et al. (U.S. Patent Publication # 6,145,083)**.

Consider **claim 66**, Walker et al. show and disclose a computing device for communicating with a remotely located computing device (Fig. 1 that shows a slot machine 2 (a computing device) that communicates via slot network 3 with a slot network server 4 (a remotely located computing device); column 3, line 60 through column 4, line 18 describe the system shown in Fig. 1; Fig. 2 and column 4, lines 19-29 describe the details of the slot machine 2; Fig. 3 and column 5, lines 21-28 disclose the

details of the slot network server 4), the computing device comprising:  
a ***non-transitory*** computer-readable medium or media encoded with instructions  
(claims 44-45) to allow the computing device to perform the following tasks:  
transmitting, upon an occurrence of a predetermined event, from the computing device  
to the remotely located computing device, a lock session signal for locking a secure  
communications session upon the occurrence of the predetermined event, the lock  
session signal configured to restrict access to the communications session until the  
computing device receives an unlock session signal from the remotely located  
computing device (Fig. 8A, steps 510-550 wherein in step 510 a remote player inserts  
the player tracking card 312 into the card reader 310 (see Fig. 2); the player identity  
information is transmitted by the slot machine to the slot server 4, which authenticates  
the information; furthermore, in step 550, the remote player is prompted to enter the  
player parameter selections, and in step 560, the server stores the parameters (lock  
start time, lock end time, etc.) for creating an automated secure playing session for the  
player at the specified lock start time (i.e. upon an occurrence of a predetermined  
event); column 8, lines 10-45 which disclose that the player parameter selection  
includes both play options and limiting criteria of play, wherein the limiting criteria  
include: (slot machine) lock start time, lock end time, etc., the lock start time specifying  
the time event when the server will transmit a lock session signal for locking a secure  
communications session at the slot machine 2, so that an automated play for the player  
may begin without interference from other players, the lock session signal configured to  
restrict access during the communications session until the computing device receives

an unlock session signal from the remotely located computing device; column 9, lines 1-6 disclose the same details, further teaching that the lock start signal prevents the slot machine 2 from providing access to other players unless automated play is terminated by the player who initiated it);

prompting a user at the computing device for identification information associated with the secure communications session (Fig. 9, steps 710-720 that show requiring the player to return to the slot machine 2 and provide identification information associated with the secure communications session; column 12, lines 14-17 describe the same details);

transmitting, from the computing device to the remotely located computing device, the identification information (Fig. 9, step 730 and column 12, lines 17-20 disclose the same details); and

receiving, at the computing device from the remotely located computing device, the unlock session signal if the identification information is authenticated (Fig. 9, steps 740 and 760-770; column 12, lines 21-39 describe the same details).

However, Walker et al. do not specifically disclose that the predetermined event comprises a detection of a departure of the user without manual input from the user.

In the same field of endeavor, Shaffer et al. disclose the claimed remotely located computing device, wherein the predetermined event comprises a detection of a departure of the user without manual input from the user (Fig. 2; column 5, lines 13-32 which describe a security module 58 connected between the user input device and the screen saver 56, that includes a timing mechanism that monitors manipulation of the

user input devices 44 to detect periods of inactivity; further disclosing that the screen saver capability is configurable with respect to selecting a particular time period, such that the screen saver 56 switches the computing device 12 to a locked mode when the computing device is idle for a period exceeding the pre-selected period; i.e. if there is no activity by any user input devices for a configurable period, the screen saver triggers a locked mode ).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide means to detect the departure of a user as a predetermined event without any manual input from the user, as taught by Shaffer et al., in the computing device of Walker et al., so as to provide a secure remote session for users.

Consider **claim 70**, and **as it applies to claim 66 above**, Walker et al., as modified by Shaffer et al., further show and disclose the claimed computing device, including wherein the predetermined event further comprises a lapse in a predetermined amount of time (in Walker et al. reference, column 8, lines 22-33 which describe limiting criteria of play as any information that may define the beginning or end of an automated play session; further disclosing that lock start time is the elapse time, from the beginning of the session, used to lock the remote automated play session for a player who initiated the session, so that no other player may be allowed to use the same slot machine; and in Shaffer et al. reference, Fig. 2; column 5, lines 13-32 that disclose the same details).

Consider **claim 80**, and as it applies to **claim 66 above**, Walker et al., as modified by Shaffer et al., further disclose the claimed computing device, wherein the identification information is not a shared screen saver password (in Walker et al. reference, Figs. 2 and 9; column 12, lines 14-20 which disclose a player tracking card 312 that provides the player identification information for authentication by the slot network server 4, thereby disclosing that the identification information is not a shared screen saver password).

Consider **claim 82**, and as it applies to **claim 66 above**, Walker et al., as modified by Shaffer et al., further disclose the claimed computing device, wherein the transmitting the lock session signal for the secure communications session comprises transmitting the lock session signal to lock the communications session at the remotely located computing device (in Walker et al. reference, Fig. 1 that shows a slot machine 2 (a computing device) that communicates via slot network 3 with a slot network server 4 (a remotely located computing device); column 3, line 60 through column 4, line 18 describe the system shown in Fig. 1; Fig. 2 and column 4, lines 19-29 describe the details of the slot machine 2; Fig. 3 and column 5, lines 21-28 disclose the details of the slot network server 4; column 8, lines 10-33 disclose that the player parameter selections include both play options and limiting criteria of play, wherein the limiting criteria include: (slot machine) lock start time, lock end time, etc., the lock start time corresponding to a lock session signal for locking a secure communications session

upon an occurrence of a predetermined event (lock start time), the lock session signal configured to restrict access to the communications session until the computing device receives an unlock session signal from the remotely located computing device; column 9, lines 1-6 disclose the same details, further disclosing that the locking data is a signal that prevents the slot machine 2 from providing access to other players unless automated play is terminated by the player who initiated it).

Consider **claim 84**, Walker et al. disclose a *non-transitory* computer-readable medium or media encoded with instructions for facilitating management of a secure communications session (claims 44-45; Fig. 1 that shows a slot machine 2 (a computing device) that communicates via slot network 3 with a slot network server 4 (a remotely located computing device); column 3, line 60 through column 4, line 18 describe the system shown in Fig. 1; Fig. 2 and column 4, lines 19-29 describe the details of the slot machine 2; Fig. 3 and column 5, lines 21-28 disclose the details of the slot network server 4), the instructions comprising code for: transmitting, upon an occurrence of a predetermined event, from a computing device to a remotely located computing device, a lock session signal for locking a communications session upon the occurrence of the predetermined event, the lock session signal configured to restrict access to the communications session until the computing device receives an unlock session signal from the remotely located computing device (Fig. 8A, steps 510-550 wherein in step 510 a remote player inserts the player tracking card 312 into the card reader 310 (see Fig. 2); the player identity

information is transmitted by the slot machine to the slot server 4, which authenticates the information; furthermore, in step 550, the remote player is prompted to enter the player parameter selections, and in step 560, the server stores the parameters (lock start time, lock end time, etc.) for creating an automated secure playing session for the player at the specified lock start time (i.e. upon an occurrence of a predetermined event); column 8, lines 10-45 which disclose that the player parameter selection includes both play options and limiting criteria of play, wherein the limiting criteria include: (slot machine) lock start time, lock end time, etc., the lock start time specifying the time event when the server will transmit a lock session signal for locking a secure communications session at the slot machine 2, so that an automated play for the player may begin without interference from other players, the lock session signal configured to restrict access during the communications session until the computing device receives an unlock session signal from the remotely located computing device; column 9, lines 1-6 disclose the same details, further teaching that the lock start signal prevents the slot machine 2 from providing access to other players unless automated play is terminated by the player who initiated it); prompting a user at the computing device for identification information associated with the communications session (Fig. 9, steps 710-720 that show requiring the player to return to the slot machine 2 and provide identification information associated with the secure communications session; column 12, lines 14-17 describe the same details); transmitting, from the computing device to the remotely located computing device, the identification information (Fig. 9, step 730 and column 12, lines 17-20 disclose the same

details); and

receiving, at the computing device from the remotely located computing device, the unlock session signal if the identification information is authenticated (Fig. 9, steps 740 and 760-770; column 12, lines 21-39 describe the same details).

However, Walker et al. do not specifically disclose that the predetermined event comprises a detection of a departure of the user without manual input from the user.

In the same field of endeavor, Shaffer et al. disclose the claimed computer-readable medium, wherein the predetermined event comprises a detection of a departure of the user without manual input from the user (security system claim 11; Fig. 2; column 5, lines 13-32 which describe a security module 58 connected between the user input device and the screen saver 56, that includes a timing mechanism that monitors manipulation of the user input devices 44 to detect periods of inactivity; further disclosing that the screen saver capability is configurable with respect to selecting a particular time period, such that the screen saver 56 switches the computing device 12 to a locked mode when the computing device is idle for a period exceeding the pre-selected period; i.e. if there is no activity by any user input devices for a configurable period, the screen saver triggers a locked mode ).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a computer-readable medium with executable instructions to detect the departure of a user as a predetermined event without any manual input from the user, as taught by Shaffer et al., in the computer-readable medium of Walker et al., so as to provide a secure remote session for users.

Consider **claim 85**, Walker et al. show and disclose a method for facilitating management of a secure communications session from a computing device (Fig. 1 that shows a method for facilitating management of a secure communications session from a computing device, wherein a slot machine 2 (a remotely located computing device) communicates via slot network 3 with a slot network server 4 (a computing device); column 3, line 60 through column 4, line 18 describe the method of communication shown in Fig. 1; Fig. 2 and column 4, lines 19-29 describe the details of the slot machine 2; Fig. 3 and column 5, lines 21-28 disclose the details of the slot network server 4), comprising the steps of:

transmitting, upon an occurrence of a predetermined event, from the computing device to a remotely located computing device, a lock session signal for locking a secure communications session upon the occurrence of the predetermined event, the lock session signal configured to restrict access to the communications session until the computing device receives an unlock session signal from the remotely located computing device (Fig. 8A, steps 510-550 wherein in step 510 a remote player inserts the player tracking card 312 into the card reader 310 (see Fig. 2); the player identity information is transmitted by the slot machine to the slot server 4, which authenticates the information; furthermore, in step 550, the remote player is prompted to enter the player parameter selections, and in step 560, the server stores the parameters (lock start time, lock end time, etc.) for creating an automated secure playing session for the player at the specified lock start time (i.e. upon an occurrence of a predetermined

event); column 8, lines 10-45 which disclose that the player parameter selection includes both play options and limiting criteria of play, wherein the limiting criteria include: (slot machine) lock start time, lock end time, etc., the lock start time specifying the time event when the server will transmit a lock session signal for locking a secure communications session at the slot machine 2, so that an automated play for the player may begin without interference from other players, the lock session signal configured to restrict access during the communications session until the computing device receives an unlock session signal from the remotely located computing device; column 9, lines 1-6 disclose the same details, further teaching that the lock start signal prevents the slot machine 2 from providing access to other players unless automated play is terminated by the player who initiated it);

prompting a user at the computing device for identification information associated with the communications session (Fig. 9, steps 710-720 that show requiring the player to return to the slot machine 2 and provide identification information associated with the secure communications session; column 12, lines 14-17 describe the same details);

transmitting, from the computing device to the remotely located computing device, the identification information (Fig. 9, step 730 and column 12, lines 17-20 disclose the same details); and

receiving, at the computing device from the remotely located computing device, the unlock session signal if the identification information is authenticated (Fig. 9, steps 740 and 760-770; column 12, lines 21-39 describe the same details).

However, Walker et al. do not specifically disclose that the predetermined event comprises a detection of a departure of the user without manual input from the user.

In the same field of endeavor, Shaffer et al. disclose the claimed method, wherein the predetermined event comprises a detection of a departure of the user without manual input from the user (Fig. 2; column 5, lines 13-32 which describe a security module 58 connected between the user input device and the screen saver 56, that includes a timing mechanism that monitors manipulation of the user input devices 44 to detect periods of inactivity; further disclosing that the screen saver capability is configurable with respect to selecting a particular time period, such that the screen saver 56 switches the computing device 12 to a locked mode when the computing device is idle for a period exceeding the pre-selected period; i.e. if there is no activity by any user input devices for a configurable period, the screen saver triggers a locked mode ).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a method to detect the departure of a user as a predetermined event without any manual input from the user, as taught by Shaffer et al., in the method of Walker et al., so as to provide a secure remote session for users.

**Claims 67, 68, 72-74, 77-79 and 81** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Walker et al. (U.S. Patent Publication # 6,244,957 B1)** in view of **Shaffer et al. (U.S. Patent Publication # 6,145,083)** and further in view of **Shoemaker et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication # 2005/0080915 A1)**.

Consider **claim 67**, and as it applies to **claim 66 above**, Walker et al., as modified by Shaffer et al., show and disclose the claimed computing device, except wherein the computing device is configured to facilitate communication of the secure communications session using a first communication channel and is configured to facilitate communication of the lock session signal, the unlock session signal, and the identification information using a second communication channel.

In the same field of endeavor, Shoemaker et al. disclose the claimed computing device, wherein the computing device is configured to facilitate communication of the secure communications session using a first communication channel and is configured to facilitate communication of the lock session signal, the unlock session signal, and the identification information using a second communication channel (Fig. 1B that shows different channels being used for user interface (UI channel 210) and media (channel 208) transmission; paragraph 0087 discloses the same details).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to configure the computing device to facilitate communication of the secure communications session using a first communication channel and to facilitate communication of the lock session signal, the unlock session signal, and the identification information using a second communication channel, as taught by Shoemaker et al., in the computing device of Walker et al., as modified by Shaffer et al., so that separate virtual channels may be provided for carrying serial

device communication and presentation data from the server, as well as encrypted client mouse and keyboard data.

Consider **claim 68**, and **as it applies to claim 67 above**, Walker et al., as modified by Shaffer et al. and Shoemaker et al., further show and disclose the claimed computing device, wherein the second communication channel is a Citrix® Independent Computing Architecture TM (ICA) Virtual Channel (in Shoemaker et al. reference, paragraph 0086 which discloses that the second communication channel can be a Citrix® Independent Computing Architecture TM (ICA) Virtual Channel).

Consider **claim 72**, and **as it applies to claim 66 above**, Walker et al., as modified by Shoemaker et al., further show and disclose the claimed computing device, wherein the computing device is a personal computer (in Shoemaker et al. reference, paragraphs 0054 and 0085 which disclose that the computing device can be a personal computer).

Consider **claim 73**, and **as it applies to claim 66 above**, Walker et al., as modified by Shaffer et al. and Shoemaker et al., further show and disclose the claimed computing device, wherein the computing device is an automated teller machine (ATM) (in Shoemaker et al. reference, paragraph 0054 which discloses that the computing device can be an Automated Teller Machine).

Consider **claim 74**, and **as it applies to claim 66 above**, Walker et al., as modified by Shaffer et al. and Shoemaker et al., further show and disclose the claimed computing device, wherein the computing device is an industrial controller (in Shoemaker et al. reference, paragraph 0054 which discloses that the computing device can be an environment control element (industrial controller)).

Consider **claim 77**, and **as it applies to claim 66 above**, Walker et al., as modified by Shaffer et al. and Shoemaker et al., further show and disclose the claimed computing device, wherein the computing device is a thin client (in Shoemaker et al. reference, paragraphs 0003, 0082, 0084 and 0085 which disclose that the computing device can be a thin client).

Consider **claim 78**, and **as it applies to claim 66 above**, Walker et al., as modified by Shaffer et al. and Shoemaker et al., further show and disclose the claimed computing device, wherein the computing device is a personal digital assistant (PDA) (in Shoemaker et al. reference, paragraph 0019 which disclose that the computing device can be a personal digital assistant (PDA)).

Consider **claim 79**, and **as it applies to claim 66 above**, Walker et al., as modified by Shaffer et al. and Shoemaker et al., further show and disclose the claimed computing device, wherein the computing device is a cellular telephone (in Shoemaker

et al. reference, paragraph 0019 which disclose that the computing device can be a cellular telephone.

Consider **claim 81**, and **as it applies to claim 66 above**, Walker et al., as modified by Shaffer et al. and Shoemaker et al., further show and disclose the claimed computing device, wherein the computing device is configured to allow a session management operation to be triggered locally using an application at the computing device, but executed at the remotely located computing device (in Shoemaker et al. reference, paragraph 0088 which disclose that a virtual channel application has two parts, a client-side component and a server-side component; further disclosing that the server-side component is an executable program running on the terminal server, and the client-side component is a DLL loaded into memory on the client computer when the terminal services client program runs).

**Claims 71 and 76** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Walker et al. (U.S. Patent Publication # 6,244,957 B1)** in view of **Shaffer et al. (U.S. Patent Publication # 6,145,083)** and further in view of **Hughes (U.S. Patent Publication # 6,854,009 B1)**.

Consider **claim 71**, and **as it applies to claim 66 above**, Walker et al., as modified by Shaffer et al., show and disclose the claimed computing device, except wherein the predetermined event is an activation of a screen saver.

In the same field of endeavor, Hughes discloses the claimed computing device, wherein the predetermined event is an activation of a screen saver (column 27, lines 37-53 disclose the same details).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to activate a screen saver at the predetermined event, as taught by Hughes, in the computing device of Walker et al., as modified by Shaffer et al., so as to maintain the security during the period, the user of the computing device is away from the remote session.

Consider **claim 76**, and as it applies to **claim 66 above**, Walker et al., as modified by Shaffer et al. and Hughes, further show and disclose the claimed computing device, wherein the computing device is an internet protocol (IP) telephone (in Hughes reference, Fig. 5, column 6, lines 55-62 and column 11, lines 30-39 that disclose the details of the claimed IP telephone).

**Claim 75** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Walker et al. (U.S. Patent Publication # 6,244,957 B1)** in view of **Shaffer et al. (U.S. Patent Publication # 6,145,083)** and further in view of **Hsu et al. (U.S. Patent Publication # 6,876,644 B1)**.

Consider **claim 75**, and as it applies to **claim 66 above**, Walker et al., as modified by Shaffer et al., show and disclose the claimed computing device, except wherein the computing device is a gateway.

In the same field of endeavor, Hsu et al. disclose the claimed computing device, wherein the computing device is a gateway (column 6, line 56 through column 7, line 9 which disclose that the proxy gateway server 20 selectively controls access by the digital telephone 16 to additional servers via a packet switched network and based on the validation of security information supplied by the digital telephone).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a gateway as a computing device, as taught by Hsu et al., in the computing device of Walker et al., as modified by Shaffer et al., so as to provide a secure remote session.

**Claims 83 and 86** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Walker et al. (U.S. Patent Publication # 6,244,957 B1)** in view of **Shaffer et al. (U.S. Patent Publication # 6,145,083)** and further in view of **Wright et al. (U.S. Patent Publication # 7,089,508 B1)**.

Consider **claim 83**, and as it applies to **claim 66 above**, Walker et al., as modified by Shaffer et al., further disclose the claimed computing device, wherein the computing device is configured to facilitate a session lock at the remotely located computing device (in Walker et al. reference, Fig. 8A, steps 510-550 wherein in step

510 a remote player inserts the player tracking card 312 into the card reader 310 (see Fig. 2); the player identity information is transmitted by the slot machine to the slot server 4, which authenticates the information and creates a secure session with the player; furthermore, in step 550, the remote player is prompted to enter the player parameter selections; column 8, lines 10-33 disclose that the player parameter selections include both play options and limiting criteria of play, wherein the limiting criteria include: (slot machine) lock start time, lock end time, etc., the lock start time corresponding to a lock session signal for locking a secure communications session upon an occurrence of a predetermined event (lock start time), the lock session signal configured to restrict access to the communications session until the computing device receives an unlock session signal from the remotely located computing device; column 9, lines 1-6 disclose the same details, further disclosing that the locking data is a signal that prevents the slot machine 2 from providing access to other players unless automated play is terminated by the player who initiated it).

However, Walker et al., as modified by Shaffer et al., do not specifically disclose that the computing device is configured to facilitate a local lock at the computing device.

In the same field of endeavor, Wright disclose the claimed computing device, wherein the computing device is configured to facilitate a local lock at the computing device (abstract that discloses a method for preventing the activation of a screen saver for locking user access to a computer while a user is near the computer; column 1, lines 12-38 disclose an office personal computer, for use by a plurality of users, that uses the screen saver lock access to the computer after a specified period of keyboard or mouse

inactivity; further disclosing that authorized users may gain access to the locked local computer by entering their userid and the common password).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to configure the computing device to facilitate a local lock at the computing device, as taught by Wright, in the computing device of Walker et al., as modified by Shaffer et al., so as to provide a secure computing environment for a local shared computing device.

Consider **claim 86**, and **as it applies to claim 66 above**, Walker et al., as modified by Shaffer et al. and Wright et al., further disclose the claimed computing device, wherein the detection of the departure of the user without manual input from the user is performed using at least one of the following without manual input by the user indicating the departure: a motion detector, a presence or an absence of a dedicated short range communication identification device, or an altered biometric data of the user (in Shaffer et al. reference, column 1, lines 42-46 which disclose using biometric technique such as voiceprint authentication to recognize an authorized user; and in Wright et al. reference, column 1, lines 56-58 which describe a controller that includes a motion sensor, such as a motion detector, for detecting a user's activity (and presence) within a predetermined perimeter of the computer whose screen may be locked; also see Figs. 11, 18 and column 5, lines 26-49 in the cited but not used reference (US Patent Publication 7,069,444 B2 to Lowensohn et al.) that uses biometric data for detecting user's presence).

**Claim 87** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Walker et al. (U.S. Patent Publication # 6,244,957 B1)** in view of **Shaffer et al. (U.S. Patent Publication # 6,145,083)** and further in view of **Hendriks et al. (U.S. Patent Publication # 7,219,233 B1)**.

Consider **claim 87**, and as it applies to **claim 66 above**, Walker et al., as modified by Shaffer et al., disclose the claimed computing device, including wherein the tasks further comprise receiving information about the user (Fig. 8A, steps 510-550 wherein in step 510 a remote player inserts the player tracking card 312 into the card reader 310 (see Fig. 2); the player identity information is transmitted by the slot machine to the slot server 4, which authenticates the information; furthermore, in step 550, the remote player is prompted to enter the player parameter selections, and in step 560, the server stores the parameters (lock start time, lock end time, etc.) for creating an automated secure playing session for the player at the specified lock start time (i.e. upon an occurrence of a predetermined event); column 8, lines 10-45 which disclose that the player parameter selection includes both play options and limiting criteria of play, wherein the limiting criteria include: (slot machine) lock start time, lock end time, etc.).

However, Walker et al., as modified by Shaffer et al., do not explicitly disclose wherein the detection of the departure of the user without manual input from the user is

performed by software configured to use artificial intelligence to examine input or writing style of another user.

In the same field of endeavor, Hendriks et al. show and disclose the claimed computing device, wherein the detection of the departure of the user without manual input from the user is performed by software configured to use artificial intelligence to examine input or writing style of another user (Fig. 6; column 9, lines 27-30 that teach using artificial intelligence in identifying a user by analyzing the physical dynamics of the user's handwriting as is done in signature verification and/or handwriting analysis).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use software configured to use artificial intelligence to examine input or writing style of a user, as taught by Hendriks et al., in the computing device of Walker et al., as modified by Shaffer et al., so as to provide a secure computing environment for an unattended computing device.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicants' arguments filed 10/27/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. After carefully reviewing the applicants' arguments and the examiner's cited prior art used to reject the presented claims, the examiner has concluded that the cited references provide adequate disclosure to maintain claim rejections. The examiner's response to applicants' arguments is listed below:

The applicants' response to 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph rejection for the independent **claim 85** (as well as other independent claims 66 and 84) contradicts the

statements made in the abstract and paragraph 0044 of the specification. Please refer to the bolded addition to the 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph rejection for the independent claim 85 for further details.

In conclusion, the examiner still maintains the rejections of claims 66-68 and 70-87 based on the previously cited references.

***Conclusion***

Any response to this Office Action should be **faxed to (571) 273-8300 or mailed to:**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Art Unit: 2443

**Hand-delivered responses** should be brought to

Customer Service Window  
Randolph Building  
401 Dulany Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Kishin G. Belani whose telephone number is (571) 270-1768. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 6:00 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Tonia Dollinger can be reached on (571) 272-4170. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free) or 703-305-3028.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist/customer service whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

*/K. G. B./*  
*Examiner, Art Unit 2443*

December 27, 2010

*/PHUOC NGUYEN/*  
*Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2443*